



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,543	11/29/2001	Helmut Scherzer	DE920000042	7268
48233	7590	03/14/2008	EXAMINER	
SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.			SHRESTHA, BIJENDRA K	
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA				
SUITE 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/997,543	SCHERZER, HELMUT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BIJENDRA K. SHRESTHA	3691	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-15 are presented for examination. Applicant filed an amendment on 10/31/2007 submitting argument against previous office action. After careful consideration of applicant's arguments, the Examiner maintains rejection of all the claims as set forth in detail below.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees the Applicant argument against "Double Patenting" rejection against U.S. Patent No. 6, 711, 685. As per claim 1-4, 7 and 10-15 of instant application, claims 1-15 of '685 patent teaches using a counter for counting the uses of protected data element (age information), setting counter to starting value, increasing counter value, resetting counter value, blocking use of data on reaching a threshold maximum, an event consisting one or more events, secret information is a code for encoding data, and secret information is a secret function for executing safety relevant operation on a chip card. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. Examiner, therefore, maintains double patenting rejections for claims 1-4, 7 and 10-15 of the instant application and requests to issue terminal disclaimer to overcome the rejection in response to this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,949,880 (reference A in attached PTO-892) in view of Kingdon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,615,193 (reference B in attached PTO-892).

3. As per claim 1, Curry et al. teach an electronic purse data carrier for performing monetary transactions, comprising

a storage means for storing one or more payment units each having a respective monetary value (see Fig. 2, column , lines 59-67 to column 2, lines 1-6;);

each of said payment units comprising

an age information for delimiting use of the payment unit (see Fig. 2; column 3, lines 66-67 to column 4, lines 1-4; where counter 206 in data carrier keep track of number of transaction (frequency of use) performed delimiting use of payment unit); and

Curry et al. do not teach that each of said payment units having a respective unique payment unit-ID (Examiner notes that Portable Module (Fig.2) have unique ID Number (210) is capable to store at least one payment unit of any amount meeting the requirement of limitation of this claim).

Kingdon et al. teach that each of said payment units having a respective unique payment unit-ID (see Fig. 1-2; column 5, lines 26-34; where unique identity tag is associated with monitory value).

Therefore, it would be prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include payment units having a respective unique

payment unit-ID of Curry et al. because Kingdon et al. teach that incorporating above features enables to detect fraud and provides means to assess levels of fraudulent exposure (Kingdon et al., column 3, lines 2-7).

4. As per claim 2, Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. teach claim 1 as described above.

Curry et al. further teach the carrier, in which said age information reflects the extent of transactional use of the respective payment unit (see Fig. 2, Counter (206) and Timer (208); column 3, lines 66-67 to column 4, lines 1-4; where timer and counter enables to track frequency use of the payment unit of portable module).

5. As per claim 3, Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. teach claim 2 as described above.

Curry et al. further teach the carrier, in which said age information represents a date information (see Fig. 2; column 4, lines 2-5; where timer 208 provide timestamp (date) information).

6. As per claim 4, Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. teach claim 3 as described above.

Curry et al. further teach the carrier comprising a processor for read and /or write access to said storage means, and means for updating said age information whenever a transaction has been performed with a respective payment unit (see Fig. 2; column 4, lines 4-6; where memory controller

(processor) 204 controls read and write access to memory 202 and updates transaction counter and timer data to the memory).

7. As per claim 10, Curry et al. teach a banking terminal device for accessing purse data stored in a storage means of an electronic purse data carrier for performing monetary transactions, the storage means storing one or more payment units each having a respective monetary value (Fig. 1; Fig. 4, column 7, lines 28-39; where portable module is used to pay for a train fare), characterized by each of said payment units comprising an age information evaluable for delimiting the use of the payment unit -ID (see Fig. 2; column 3, lines 66-67 to column 4, lines 1-4; where counter 206 in data carrier keep track of number of transaction (frequency of use) performed delimiting use of payment unit), and the banking terminal device comprising:

implemented program means for verifying said age information (see Fig. 1; Fig. 4, steps X6; column 7, lines 55-60; where), and

implemented program means for resetting said age information after successful verification of said payment unit (see Figs. 1 and 4; step X12; where portable transaction counter is incremented or reset after successful transaction deducting the train fare); and

Curry et al. do not teach each of said payment units having a respective unique payment unit-ID (Examiner notes that Portable Module (Fig.2) have unique ID Number (210) is capable to store at least one payment unit of any amount meeting the requirement of limitation of this claim).

Kingdon et al. teach each of said payment units having a respective unique payment unit-ID (see Fig. 3-5; column 5, lines 26-57).

Therefore, it would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include payment units having a respective unique payment unit-ID of Curry et al. because Kingdon et al. teach that incorporating above features enables to detect fraud and provides means to assess levels of fraudulent exposure (Kingdon et al., column 3, lines 2-7).

8. As per claim 11, Curry et al. teach a trading transaction device comprising:
 - means for entering a trading price, an input interface for a first mobile electronic purse data carrier for performing monetary transactions (see Fig. 1; column 2, lines 38-45; column 7, lines 40-44; where microprocessor base device 104 is trading device),
 - the carrier comprising
 - a storage means for storing one or more payment units each having a respective monetary value, characterized by each of said payment units comprising an age information evaluable for delimiting the use of the payment unit (see Fig. 1; column 7, lines 61-67 to column 8, lines 1-2, 16-29; where monetary value (for train fare) is transferred from portable module to trading transaction device(secure module) which is programmed like portable module);
 - a connective interface to second such carrier (see Fig. 1; column 2, lines 45-68; column 8, lines 26-29; where 106 forms a connective interface between portable

module 102 and secure microprocessor based devices (credit carrier) 108 through microprocessor device 104); and

means for updating the storage means of both carriers according to the transaction to be traded (see Fig. 4; column 7, lines 59-67 to column 8, lines 1-2, 14-25).

Curry et al. do not teach that each of said payment units having a respective unique payment unit-ID (Examiner notes that Portable Module (Fig.2) have unique ID Number (210) is capable to store at least one payment unit of any amount meeting the requirement of limitation of this claim).

Kingdon et al. teach that each of said payment units having a respective unique payment unit-ID (see Fig. 3-5; column 5, lines 26-57).

Therefore, it would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include payment units having a respective unique payment unit-ID of Curry et al. because Kingdon et al. teach that incorporating above features enables to detect fraud and provides means to assess levels of fraudulent exposure (Kingdon et al., column 3, lines 2-7).

9. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,949,880 (reference A in attached PTO-892) in view of Kingdon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,615,193 (reference B in attached PTO-892) further in view of Teicher (reference AA in IDS submitted by the applicant).

10. As per claim 5, Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. teach claim 4 as described above.

Curry et al. further teach means for transferring a respective age information from said parent unit to the plurality of child payment units, and means for generating a resulting age information for said joined payment unit according to a predetermined rule (see Fig. 5, steps Y10-Y13; column 9, lines 3-12; where age information is transferred from ATM 112 to portable module (data carrier); Examiner interprets process is transferring age information between card to card is essentially same as that from ATM to cards as explained in Teicher reference below).

Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. do not teach means for splitting a parent payment unit having a given non-minimum parent monetary value into a plurality of child payment units, each having a child monetary value smaller than the parent value, the sum of child monetary values being the same as the parent monetary value, and means for joining a plurality of single payment units having a given total monetary value into a joined payment unit having a corresponding same monetary value.

Teicher teaches means for splitting a parent payment unit having a given non-minimum parent monetary value into a plurality of child payment units, each having a child monetary value smaller than the parent value, the sum of child monetary values being the same as the parent monetary value, and means for joining a plurality of single payment units having a given total monetary value into a joined payment unit having a corresponding same monetary value (see column 26, lines 59-67; column 27, lines 1-10; where card to card transaction feature allows transfer of electronic coins through

transaction device (essentially similar to purse-to-drawer interface) while maintaining the integrity of the system).

Therefore, it would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow splitting a parent payment unit having a given non-minimum parent monetary value into a plurality of child payment units of Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. because Teicher teaches that splitting a parent payment unit having a given non-minimum parent monetary value into a plurality of child payment units enable person-to-person transactions (Teicher, column 26, lines 61-63).

11. As per claim 6, Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. further in view of Teicher teach claim 5 as described above.

Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. do not teach means for generating a patching pattern for splitting and/or joining payment units according to storage requirements present on the carrier.

Teicher teaches means for generating a patching pattern for splitting and/or joining payment units according to storage requirements present on the carrier (see column 27, lines 1-9; where card-to-card transaction are limited according to the electronic coins stored in both cards).

Therefore, it would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow means for generating a patching pattern for splitting and/or joining payment units according to storage requirements present on the carrier of Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. because Teicher teaches that means for generating a patching pattern for splitting and/or joining payment units according to

storage requirements present on the carrier would limit card-to-card payment according to the amount actually stored in both cards (Teicher, column 27, lines 4-6).

12. As per claim 7, Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. further in view of Teicher teach claim 5 as described above.

Curry et al. teach the carrier comprising means for excluding a payment unit from an intended split or join process if said payment unit has exceeded a predetermined change threshold age level (Curry et al., Fig. 4, steps X6 and X7; column 7, lines 50-54).

13. As per claim 8, Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. further in view of Teicher teach claim 7 as described above.

Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. do not teach a plurality of payment units of different monetary value.

Teicher teaches a plurality of payment units of different monetary value (see Fig. 26, column 2, lines 49-53).

Therefore, it would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow a plurality of payment units of different monetary value Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. because Teicher teaches that allowing a plurality of payment units of different monetary value would minimize storage requirements for electronic coins and provide signal for security leak, if there is forbidden repetition or out-of-range instances (Teicher, column 2, lines 55-65).

14. As per claim 9, Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. teach claim 1 as described above.

Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. do not teach means for storing personal identification Data associated with one or more payment units.

Teicher teaches means for storing personal identification data associated with one or more payment units (see column 27, lines 36-44).

Therefore, it would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow means for storing personal identification data associated with one or more payment units of Curry et al. in view of Kingdon et al. because Teicher teaches that allowing means for storing personal identification Data associated with one or more payment units would enable to identify unused electronic bills upon the expiration date (Teicher, column 27, lines 51-51).

15. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,949,880 (reference A in attached PTO-892) in view of Wallace, U.S. Patent No. 5,988,497 (reference C in attached PTO-892).

16. As per claim 12, Curry et al. teach a method for managing electronic payments with an electronic purse data carrier, comprising the steps of:

checking for each transaction if age information of a payment unit being part of the transaction has matching transaction count, and restricting the use of a payment unit with not matched transaction counter (see Fig. 1; Fig. 4, step X6; column 7, lines 50-54; where transaction occurs only if transaction count (age information) matches).

Curry et al. do not teach checking for each transaction if age information of a payment unit being part of the transaction has exceeded a predetermined transaction

age threshold level, and restricting the use of a payment unit with an exceeded transaction age threshold level.

Wallace teach checking for each transaction if age information of a payment unit being part of the transaction has exceeded a predetermined transaction age threshold level, and restricting the use of a payment unit with an exceeded transaction age threshold level (Wallace, Fig. 1, step 110 and 118; column 2, lines 4-29; where threshold condition such as frequency of use or other conditions that could be set by service provider must be satisfied in order to approve the transaction).

Therefore, it would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include checking for each transaction if age information of a payment unit being part of the transaction has exceeded a predetermined transaction age threshold level, and restricting the use of a payment unit with an exceeded transaction age threshold level of Curry et al. because Wallace teaches that incorporating above features enables deter fraudulent use of credit card (Wallace, column 27-33).

17. As per claim 13, Curry et al. in view of Wallace teach claim 12 as described above.

Curry et al. further teach the method comprising the steps of:
using an age counter mechanism for checking the age information of a payment unit (see Fig. 4, step X1; Fig. 5, step Y1; transaction count (age information) is checked by transaction counter 206 in Fig. 2),
the counter mechanism being

implemented by encrypting a target number X, by successively applying, a total of m-times, a private key to a source key and the respective application result, said source key representing unused age information (see Fig. 4, step X1 and X2; column 7, lines 20-27),

said target number X being the result of applying, a total of n-times, a public key to said source key, on each payment transaction applying said public key on said age information yielding a respective current age data (see Fig. 4, step X4; column 7, lines 40-44), and

checking for each transaction if the age information of a payment unit being part of the transaction corresponds to the target number X (see Fig. 4, step X5 and X6).

18. As per claim 14, Curry et al. in view of Wallace teach claim 13 as described above.

Curry et al. further teach the method, in which repetitive application of the public key to said source key, and the respective application results yields a monotone varying function with a transaction age threshold value corresponding to said target number X (see Fig. 4, steps X4-X6; where public key repetitively applied to source key (encrypted data packet) as transaction counter is updated after each successful transaction; transaction is permitted if and only if counter number matches).

19. As per claim 15, Curry et al teach computer program product stored on a computer usable medium comprising computer readable program means for causing a

computer to manage electronic payments with an electronic purse data carrier, where the carrier stores age information corresponding to payment units stored thereon, the computer program product causing the computer to perform the steps of:

 checking for each transaction if age information of a payment unit being part of the transaction has matching transaction count, and restricting the use of a payment unit with not matched transaction counter (see Fig. 3, steps X6 and X7; column 7, lines 50-54; Fig. 5; steps Y6 and Y7; column 8, lines 59-65; the secure model is programmed to check matching of its counter transaction number with decrypted data's transaction counter number and transaction proceeds forward if and only if they are exact match, to make sure that data received is not counterfeit data).

Curry et al. do not teach checking for each transaction if age information of a payment unit being part of the transaction has exceeded a predetermined transaction age threshold level, and restricting the use of a payment unit with an exceeded transaction age threshold level.

Wallace teach checking for each transaction if age information of a payment unit being part of the transaction has exceeded a predetermined transaction age threshold level, and restricting the use of a payment unit with an exceeded transaction age threshold level (see Fig. 1, step 110 and 118; column 2, lines 4-29; column 5, lines 23-34; where threshold condition such as frequency of use or other conditions that could be set by service provider must be satisfied in order to approve the transaction).

Therefore, it would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include checking for each transaction if age information

of a payment unit being part of the transaction has exceeded a predetermined transaction age threshold level, and restricting the use of a payment unit with an exceeded transaction age threshold level of Curry et al. because Wallace teaches that incorporating above features enables deter fraudulent use of credit card (Wallace, column 4, lines 31-49).

Response to Arguments

20. After careful consideration of applicant's arguments, the Examiner maintains rejection of all the claims.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant argument nowhere does the text or drawing figures suggest storage means for storing payment unit comprising an age information for delimiting the use of payment unit. Curry et al. teach process of taking cash out of ATM machine and transferring the cash into the portable module 102 (see Fig. 5; column 8, lines 32-37; column 1, lines 61-67 to column 2, lines1-6). The portable module comprises transaction counter and timer to track the number of transaction the module has performed and provide the time stamp to the transaction performed (see Fig. 2, column 3, lines 66-67 to column 4, lines). During the transaction processing such as purchasing a train fare, transaction processor (microprocessor device, 104) checks time stamp sent by portable module to see indication of whether payment is still valid or time stamp may further enable to decide if the data is counterfeit or not (see column 7, lines 55-60). The Examiner notes that Applicant provides examples of he term “dynamic age level” on page 5, lines 8-15 of the specification

where it states “ evaluation may thus yield an answer to a type of questions like how often has respective payment unit been involved in a transaction?” (i.e. number of transactions). Therefore, age information includes frequency of use of payment card or payment units as taught by Curry et al. Examiner further notes that Curry et al. teach electronic purse carrier to store at least one payment unit having monetary value and unique ID meeting the limitation of claim 1 and 10-11 (Claim recites “one or more payment units”) (see Fig. 1, column 4, lines 7-9).

Kingdon et al. teach each payment units (or value) having respective unique payment (or tag) ID. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant argument that Kingdon tag units are not equivalent to the claimed payment units. Kingdon et al. teach deficiency of telephone payment cards where operator has no means of identifying users and telephone services are provided anonymously (see column 2, lines 10-25). Kingdon et al. further teach stored electronic value systems using number or token representative of described value (see column 3, lines 8-21; Fig. 1-2; column 5, lines 15-25). The Examiner notes the idea of identifying each monetary value to enable auditing and detecting fraud is similar to identifying each payment unit of the instant application.

Curry et al. further teach verifying age information and resetting age information after successful transaction by comparing data between secure module and portable module such as transaction count and time stamp (see Fig. 4; column 7, lines 45-60) and incrementing transaction counter (see column 8, lines 13-15) after completion of transaction.

Examiner further disagrees with the Applicant argument that there is no means for entering a trading price, an input interface for first mobile electronic purse data carrier for performing monetary transactions, updating storage means of both carriers according to the transaction traded. Curry et al. teach a process of purchasing a train fare (see Fig. 4, column 7, lines 30-35) where secure module subtract cost of train fare from portable module (see Fig. 4, lines 61-65, column 8, lines 16-25).

The Applicant further argues that Wallace does not indicate or disclose restricting the use of payment with an exceeded transaction age threshold, if age information of payment unit exceeds a predetermined transaction age threshold. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant defines the term “dynamic age level” on page 5, lines 8-15 of the specification where it states “ evaluation may thus yield an answer to a type of questions like how often has respective payment unit been involved in a transaction?”. This affirm that age information include frequency of use of payment card or payment units as taught by Curry et al. and Wallace. Wallace teaches checking numerous threshold criteria or conditions (including frequency of use of a card) which can be set by the service provider (see column 2, lines 4-25) and teachings of Williams can be combined with Curry et al. to check whether user have exceeded threshold limit of use of payment unit enabling to restrict the payment and to deter fraudulent use of a card (column 4, lines 31-49).

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosures. The following are pertinent to current invention, though not relied upon:

Bellare et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,625) teach method for electronic payment system with issuer control.

Collin (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,646) teaches transaction system of electronic purse type.

Graves et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,575,361) teach system and method for managing stored-value card data.

Jones et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,440,634) teaches electronic purse value transfer system.

Hjelmvik (U.S. Patent No. 6,431,454) teach method of effecting payment with a card that includes an electronic purse.

Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,263) teach electronic purse application system and method thereof.

Nakano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,438) teach electronic wallet system.

Rankl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,534,683) teach multifunctional card having an electronic purse.

Shiobara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,653) teach electronic money management.

Teicher (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,075) teach retail unit and payment unit for serving a customer with electronic wallet on purchase and method for executing the same.

After careful consideration of applicant's arguments, the Examiner maintains rejection of all the claims. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bijendra K. Shrestha whose telephone number is (571) 270-1374. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM (Monday-Friday); 2nd Friday OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3691

BKS/3691